

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 remain in the application.

By this response, Claim 1 has been amended so that the claimed method defines steps A-E, "in succession," as presented in claim 1 as filed. No new matter is added. The amendment is believed to place the application in condition for allowance, as discussed at the interview dated January 20, 2004.

In the Office Action, claims 1-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,811,438 to Economou, in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0050589 A1 to McDevitt et al. and U.S. Patent No. 4,833,238 to Lucca, et al. Claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Economou in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,309,369 to Lebovic. Issue is taken with that position.

Claim 1 in the subject application provides a particular method for treating puncture wounds extending to a blood vessel. The Applicants respectfully submit that none of the prior art references cited by the Examiner discloses a method for treatment of a puncture wound, which extends to a blood vessel.

Pursuant to discussions at the interview, claim 1 claims a method which now requires steps A-E to be performed in the specified succession disclosed in the specification. That method combines applying pressure proximal to the puncture wound in order to at least partially collapse the blood vessel, followed by directing an application surface, which comprises a cationic biopolymer of glucosamine to, the puncture wound. No cited prior art teaches or suggests the claimed succession of steps. Moreover, the prior art references Economou, McDevitt et al., and Delucca et al. did not teach or suggest the step of applying pressure proximal* to the puncture wound to collapse the blood vessel, nor did the prior art references teach or suggest a combination of the step of applying pressure to the puncture wound and the step of directing cationic biopolymer of glucosamine to the puncture wound. Therefore, the Application respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner. Dependent claims 2-36 include all the limitations of claim 1, thus also should be considered

* The term "proximal" is to be interpreted as "closely, related ...in space" or near, see Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary, page 948, (see Exhibit A) under the definition 1 of "proximal" which refers the reader to "proximate" for the above noted interpretation.

patentable over the prior art references.

Since claims 1-36 are not obvious in light of the references cited, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION


On the basis of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims 1-36 are in condition of allowance. If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

No additional costs are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this paper. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-1133.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

2/10/04



Mark G. Lappin, P.C.
Registration Number 26,618
McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
28 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
Tel.: (617) 535-4043
Fax: (617) 535-3800